

## REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending and at issue. No claims have been amended by this Response.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Allen et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,995,884 (“Allen et al.”) in view of Roy et al., “Surface Sensing and Classification for Efficient Mobile Robot Navigation” (“Roy et al.”). Applicants respectfully traverse the claim rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

The rejection of claims 1-37 as obvious over Allen et al. in view of Roy et al. should be withdrawn because neither Allen et al. nor Roy et al. discloses or suggests rotating a sweeper of a robot cleaner more in a soft surface mode than in a hard surface mode (recited by claims 1-7) or a processor that controls a robot cleaner in a selected floor type cleaning mode, including a hard surface mode and a soft surface mode (recited by claims 8-37).

The Examiner has failed to advance a *prima facie* case of obviousness because each of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest rotating a sweeper of a robot cleaner more in a soft surface mode than in a hard surface mode, or a processor that controls a robot cleaner in a selected floor type cleaning mode, including a hard surface mode and a soft surface mode. More particularly, Allen et al. fails to disclose or suggest a selected floor type cleaning mode, as acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office action.

Roy et al. fails to supply the missing disclosure or suggestion of Allen et al. Specifically, Roy et al. fails to disclose or suggest rotating a sweeper of a robot cleaner more in a soft surface mode than in a hard surface mode, or a processor that controls a robot cleaner in a selected floor type cleaning mode, including a hard surface mode and a soft surface mode, as recited by the pending claims.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Allen et al. with Roy et al. to arrive at the claimed subject matter because neither of these references teaches or suggests the subject matter of the rejected claims.

Because none of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests rotating a sweeper of a robot cleaner more in a soft surface mode than in a hard surface mode (recited by claims 1-7) or a processor that controls a robot cleaner in a selected floor type cleaning mode, including a hard surface mode and a soft surface mode (recited by claims 8-37), claims 1-37 are not obvious therefrom. Accordingly, claims 1-37 are considered to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Amendment, or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated number.

The Director is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-1818 under Order No. 112440-135.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Robert M. Gould

Reg. No. 43,642

Customer No.: 29190

Phone: (312) 807-4244

Dated: Dec. 15, 2005